

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

In re: Canon 3A(7) of the)
Delaware Judges' Code)
of Judicial Conduct)

Before HERRMANN, Chief Justice, McNEILLY, HORSEY, MOORE and
CHRISTIE, Justices.

O R D E R

This *2nd* day of May, 1983,

It Appearing:

(1) That by Order of this Court, dated January 15, 1982 (copy attached), it was provided that Canon 3A(7) of the Delaware Judges' Code of Judicial Conduct be suspended for a period of one year, commencing May 1, 1982 and ending May 1, 1983, for appellate proceedings in the Delaware Supreme Court, under guidelines to be approved by this Court; and

(2) That by Order, dated April 29, 1982 (copy attached), this Court adopted Guidelines for the governance of photographic and electronic news coverage of appellate proceedings in this Court under the above-mentioned suspension of Canon 3A(7); and

(3) That the one-year period for photographic and electronic news coverage of appellate proceedings in this Court has expired;

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE
RECEIVED and FILED
MAY 06 1983
DEPUTY CLERK
Wilmington

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED:

(A) That Canon 3A(7) of the Delaware Judges' Code of Judicial Conduct be and it is hereby suspended until further Order of this Court, for appellate proceedings in the Delaware Supreme Court under the terms and conditions set forth in the Orders of January 15 and April 29, 1982; and

(B) That as to all other judicial proceedings in this State, however, Canon 3A(7) shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect until further Order of this Court.

BY THE COURT:



Chief Justice

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

In re: Canon 3A(7) of the §
Delaware Judges' Code of §
Judicial Conduct §

Before HERRMANN, Chief Justice, DUFFY, McNEILLY, QUILLEN and
HORSEY, Justices.

ORDER

This *15th* day of January, 1982,

Upon the submission of the "Report of the Bar-Bench-Press Conference of Delaware on Television in the Courtroom," dated March 16, 1981, attached hereto as Exhibit A, recommending a one-year experiment of television, radio, tape recording, and still photography news coverage (hereinafter "photographic and electronic news coverage") of trials and appellate judicial proceedings in this State; and

Upon due consideration of (a) the debate upon that Report at the Annual Delaware Joint Bar-Bench Conference between former Chief Justice England of Florida and Dean George Gerbner of The Annenberg School of Communications of the University of Pennsylvania in June, 1981; (b) the public hearing thereupon held by this Court at which Professor Valerie P. Hans, Division of Criminal Justice and Department of Psychology of the University of Delaware, Professor Dan Slater, Department of Communication of the University of Delaware, and Mr. Sidney H. Hurlburt, Executive Editor, The News-Journal Company, appeared and testified in September, 1981; (c) the views and opinions of members of the United States Supreme Court on the subject of television, radio, and still photographic coverage of criminal trials for public broadcast,

in Estes v. Texas, 381 U.S. 532, 85 S.Ct. 1628, 14 L. Ed.2d 543 (1964) and Chandler v. Florida, 449 U.S. 560, 101 S.Ct. 802, 66 L. Ed.2d 740 (1981); (d) activity in approximately 30 States, in recent years, relative to varying degrees of relaxation of the ban on photographic and electronic news coverage of judicial proceedings mandated by prevailing Rules such as Canon 3A(7) of the Delaware Judges' Code of Judicial Conduct, copy attached hereto as Exhibit B; (e) the official positions and policies adopted on the issue of such relaxation by the American Bar Association, the American Judicature Society, and the Conference of Chief Justices; and (f) the voluminous recent writings on the subject,

IT APPEARS TO THE COURT:

(1) That as to proceedings before the Delaware Supreme Court, by reason of technological advances, none of the dangers to fair trial that gave rise to nation-wide adoption of Canon 3A(7) and its progenitors, and were visualized in the concurring opinions in Estes and acknowledged by the Court as possible in Chandler, are relevant enough to bar a test of photographic and electronic news coverage of appellate proceedings before the Delaware Supreme Court, subject to specific and detailed guidelines which the Bench-Bar-Press Conference is hereby requested to propose, in consultation with representatives of all news media involved, for approval by the Supreme Court; and that to that end, Canon 3A(7) should be suspended for a period of 1 year as to appellate proceedings before the Delaware Supreme Court;

(2) That as to trials, however, the "mischievous potentialities [of broadcast coverage] for intruding upon the detached atmosphere which should always surround the judicial process" (Estes v. Texas, 381 U. S. at 587, 85 S.Ct. at 1662) may not be lightly disregarded; that still clearly relevant are two possible threats to a defendant's constitutional right to a fair trial recognized in the concurring opinions in Estes, namely: (a) possible adverse psychological impact upon the public and upon participants in the trial, especially jurors and witnesses; and (b) possible prejudicial publicity and violation of rights of privacy of participants in the trial, especially of jurors and witnesses;

(3) That as to these fair-trial dangers, which may reasonably apply to all trials — criminal and civil, jury and non-jury — there is little or no comprehensive empirical data; that "it is clear that the general issue of the psychological impact of broadcast coverage upon the participants in a trial, and particularly upon the defendant, is still a subject of sharp debate": and that even the Florida Supreme Court, a leader in the field, has conceded the data of psychological impact upon trial participants of its experiments in photographic and electronic news coverage, were "limited" and "non-scientific." See Chandler v. Florida, 101 S.Ct. at 810, f.n. 11, and 811;

(4) That as to these dangers to the constitutional right of fair trial, a matter of vital importance in the administration of justice of course, an "experiment" in the subject field should be an "experiment" in the scientifically adequate and acceptable sense of the word — including scientific controls and

scientific evaluation which meet advanced testing techniques and requirements of the social sciences;

(5) That apparently, of the jurisdictions which have conducted, or are now conducting, experiments in the subject field, most include "attitude surveys" — but, insofar as this Court is aware, none constitutes a study employing scientific experimental design techniques necessary to produce an acceptable objective evaluation of the psychological effect of photographic and electronic news media coverage upon the public and the participants in trials;

(6) That the offer of the Bar-Bench-Press Conference, to "make itself available to monitor the experiment and to submit a report at least one month before the end of the experiment as to its recommendation," although generous, is not an acceptable substitution for such a scientific experiment upon which to base an informed policy judgment;

(7) That by Resolution adopted in February, 1981, the Board of Directors of the American Judicature Society declared that the effect of "camera coverage of judicial proceedings" on the "viewing and listening public and on courtroom participants has not been conclusively established"; it urged "those court systems permitting camera coverage of judicial proceedings to undertake scientifically-based research and evaluation to determine its effect on the viewing public and on courtroom participants"; and the Directors resolved that the Society should "continue its role in encouraging and working with other agencies, including various court systems, to ap-

and analyze empirical data on the impact of televised judicial proceedings upon which informed policy judgments can be based";

(8) That Dean Gerbner of The Annenberg School of Communications of the University of Pennsylvania, a recognized authority in the field, advises:

"Neither history nor existing research support the contention that television coverage of courts would enhance fairness, protect freedom, increase public understanding, or promote needed court reform. Only an immediate moratorium on televising trials can give us the time and the opportunity we need for responsible action.

"In the face of demonstrated conflicts and incalculable risks, the burden of proof must shift from the potential victims to the proponents of trials by television. An independent scientific investigation is what we need now, both to analyze a representative sample of televised trials and segments of trials and to assess conceptions of the judicial process that television trials cultivate in the minds of the viewers, as well as the minds of participants. Until we undertake such research and until it disproves reasonable expectations about TV's effects, we should prevent television from remaking our system of justice in its own image."

See American Judicature Society Journal, Vol. 63, No. 9, April, 1980.

(9) That Dean Gerbner has also advised waiting for the outcome of a scientific evaluation of one or more of the experiments now being conducted in other jurisdictions, rather than commencing still another experiment in this State of photographic and electronic news media coverage of trials, concluding:

"I think it is imprudent; I think it is historically short-sighted; I think it is institutionally reckless to further extend the experiment until the evidence is in, and to use our defendants as guinea pigs."

(10) That Professors Hans and Slater of the University of Delaware have advocated only a scientifically-based experiment if any experiment at all is to be held in this State of photographic and electronic news media coverage of trials;

(11) That, because of inconclusive returns from experiments already undertaken in various States, the Federal Courts and the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association remain opposed to change of the present rules prohibiting camera and radio coverage of trials; that in the summer of 1980, the President of the American Bar Association "stressed the need for a carefully planned collection and analysis of objective data dealing with the impact of camera coverage on trial proceedings" and "lamented the fact that the on-going national debate on the subject did not have the benefit of hard data upon which responsible judgments could be made";

(12) That although the Conference of Chief Justices, by Resolution adopted in 1978, favored amendment of Canon 3A(7) to allow photographic and electronic media coverage of judicial proceedings subject to the discretion of the highest appellate court in each State, that Resolution was not adopted in the light of present circumstances and did little more than state the status quo;

(13) That the estimated cost of an adequate scientifically-based and evaluated experiment in this State has been found by Professors Hans and Slater, after careful and appreciated study, to be in excess of \$25,000;

(14) That, in view of the foregoing facts and objective opinions, another experiment of photographic and electronic news coverage of trials in this State at this time, at such an expenditure, is at least inadvisable and at most risky as to potential adverse psychological effects upon the public and participants in trials;

(15) That, accordingly, the recommendation by the Bar-Bench-Press Conference of a one year experiment in photographic and electronic news coverage of trials in Delaware must be found unacceptable at this time;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED:

(A) That Canon 3A(7) of the Delaware Judges' Code of Judicial Conduct be and it is hereby suspended for a period of one year, commencing May 1, 1982 and ending May 1, 1983, for appellate proceedings in the Delaware Supreme Court, under specific and detailed guidelines (see those adopted in New Jersey, California, and Florida) to be proposed by the Bar-Bench-Press Conference, in consultation with representatives of all types of Delaware news media involved, for approval by this Court; and

(B) That as to all other judicial proceedings in this State, however, Canon 3A(7) shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect until further Order of this Court.

BY THE COURT:


Chief Justice

REPORT
OF THE
BAR-BENCH-PRESS CONFERENCE OF DELAWARE
ON
TELEVISION IN THE COURTROOM

C. Robert Taylor, Chairman
Richard R. Wier, Jr., Vice Chairman

Robert Casey
Arthur F. DiSabatino
Richard S. Gebelein
Thomas J. Miles
Richard E. Poole
Jacqueline Powers
Ronald Stevens
Clarence W. Taylor
Robert D. Thompson
Theodore Townsend

March 16, 1981

I. INTRODUCTION

On November 24, 1978 Chief Justice Daniel L. Herrmann of the Supreme Court of Delaware referred the subject of television in the courtroom to the Bar-Bench-Press Conference of Delaware for study and recommendation. On April 22, 1980 the Chief Justice requested that the report be deferred pending the decision of the United States Supreme Court in Chandler v. Florida, 49 LW 4141 (January 26, 1981). Now that Chandler has been decided, the Bar-Bench-Press Conference hereby submits its report.

The Bar-Bench-Press Conference is a voluntary group of lawyers (3), judges (3) and news representatives (6) interested in the conduct of open, fair and impartial court proceedings. In its study of the issue of television in the courtroom, the Conference reviewed the law (Section II), conducted a technical feasibility study (Section III), and undertook a survey of the opinions of all Delaware lawyers, judges and news representatives who chose to participate (Section IV). The Conference's unanimous recommendation (Section V) is that on a strictly-controlled basis the Delaware courts should permit television, radio and tape recording, and still photography for a test or trial period of one year from September 1, 1981 through August 31, 1982. A proposed court rule for the trial period is set forth in Section VI.

II. THE LAW ON ELECTRONIC COURTROOM COVERAGE

In Chandler, supra, the United States Supreme Court held unanimously that each state may decide for itself whether to experiment with electronic coverage of court proceedings, free of the risk that such coverage constitutes a per se violation of the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Some thirty states now permit electronic courtroom coverage in some form, but Chandler neither endorses nor invalidates it. Eventually the United States Supreme Court may hold that the First and Sixth Amendments mandate the entry of the electronic media into judicial proceedings, inasmuch as in Richmond Newspapers, Inc. v. Virginia, 100 S. Ct. 2814 (1980), the Court established a constitutional right of access generally. However, Nixon v. Warner Communications, Inc., 435 U. S. 589 (1977), and footnote 12 of Justice Powell's dissent in Bates v. State Bar of Arizona, 433 U. S. 350 (1977), produce uncertainty as to whether the constitutional right of access applies to any but the print media. What remains clear after Chandler is that the courts must see to it that any coverage by the electronic media is consistent with a defendant's right to a fair trial in each particular case.

III. TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY

In early 1979 Keith D. Humphry, then News Director, WHYY-TV (Channel 12), undertook a study of light, acoustics and space features of Delaware courtrooms. He concluded that "there are no insurmountable logistical problems in television coverage in Delaware's court rooms."

New Castle County Superior Court rooms 5, 6, and 7 are ideal for electronic coverage, but the other Superior Court rooms would need upgrading, particularly as to lighting, for judicial proceedings to be covered by the electronic media. Kent County Superior Court room 2 is ideal for television coverage. The Chancery Court rooms have adequate lighting, but the audio system might need some work, and space limitations there would have to be given attention. New Castle County Common Pleas Court room # 1 has lighting problems, but New Castle County Common Pleas Court room # 2 is fine for electronic coverage. The Kent County Common Pleas Court room could provide adequate illumination if the blinds were adjusted properly. Wilmington Municipal Court has a good audio system, and it also has a TV monitoring system which works well, at least as to the public seating area.

The Supreme Court of Delaware has an existing audio system that is more than adequate. There is also sufficient room in the courtroom to accomodate a television camera and its

operator. Present lighting is insufficient, but the wall fixtures could be altered to throw more light on critical areas.

It is the recommendation of the Conference that the news media be solely responsible for any expenses necessary to accommodate electronic courtroom coverage.

IV. OPINION SURVEY

A survey was conducted during the summer of 1980 by means of a mail questionnaire sent to all members of the Delaware State Bar Association, to members of the state judiciary and to news media organizations that cover Delaware. The number of questionnaires sent and returned, and the response rates, were as follows:

	<u>SENT</u>	<u>RETURNED</u>	<u>RESPONSE RATE</u>
Lawyers	1,100	444	40.4%
Judges	42	28	65.5%
Media Orgs.	43	21	48.8%

The survey asked the three groups for their opinions on the question of television coverage of the courts. Specifically, it asked respondents whether they would favor a change in court rules to allow television coverage, voice recording or still photography in the courts. It also asked whether they would favor an experiment here to test the effects of such coverage.

The survey included a number of questions designed to explore the basis of respondents' attitudes toward television in the courts. Other questions asked how the groups would react to experimental television coverage if it were allowed. Finally, a number of demographic questions were included to help determine if there were differences in attitudes among sub-classes of the three groups.

Here are some of the major findings of the survey:

Among all the respondents, 60 percent opposed an outright change in the rules, 26 percent favored a change and the rest were undecided or had no answer. Among lawyers, 64 percent opposed a change and only 23 percent favored such a change. For judges, 25 percent favored and 46 percent were opposed. For the media, 81 percent favored a rules change and 10 percent opposed it.

Attitudes toward an experiment were more favorable. While opposition was two to one against a rules change, the survey found opinion evenly divided among all respondents toward an experiment. Forty-five percent favored it and 46 percent were opposed. Among the lawyers, 49 percent were opposed and 43 percent favored it. For judges, 58 percent favored an experiment and 36 percent were opposed, and for the media 81 percent favored an experiment and 20 percent were opposed.

Attitudes among all three groups seemed to be strongly held on this subject. Those lawyers and judges opposed to the introduction of television coverage were against a rules change and also opposed any experiment. The more favorable sentiment toward an experiment resulted from lawyers undecided on the rules change switching over to favor an experiment.

There was little difference between the attitudes toward television coverage in the courts and the attitudes toward voice recording and still photography. In fact there was less support for the latter two than for television.

Differences were observed among lawyer groups in their attitudes toward television, although the majority of each group was opposed to both a change and an experiment. Younger lawyers tended to favor television, as did those from smaller firms. Older lawyers and those from large firms were more likely to oppose it.

The majority of Superior Court and Family Court judges favor an experiment to test television in the courts.

Defense lawyers tended to be more favorable toward a change in rules to allow TV, while prosecutors were more likely to oppose it, although the majority of both groups opposed any change.

Respondents did not know the extent of experimentation and rules changes in other states. When asked how many states had made changes, only 3 percent correctly answered more than 20.

The survey found strong sentiment in favor of requiring the consent of all parties to a case before television coverage is allowed, in the event of a rules change or experiment. Seventy-six percent favored such consent.

Attitudes of lawyers and judges toward a rules change or an experiment tended to correlate with their attitudes toward the performance of the news media. Those critical of the media's performance tended to be more strongly opposed.

No information is available on the attitudes or characteristics of the non-respondents to this survey.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

As noted at the outset in the Introduction, the Bar-Bench-Press Conference recommends that the courts of Delaware, during a trial period of one year beginning September 1, 1981, permit electronic coverage of judicial proceedings.

Actual television coverage is likely to be spotty, particularly after the novelty wears off. Delaware has just one public television channel, and no commercial channels apart from cable. Channel 12 maintains a rather low profile in Delaware, and the Philadelphia commercial stations cover Delaware news rather infrequently. Accordingly, the burden on the judicial system of accommodating television is likely to be modest in Delaware.

Still photography, if permitted, is likely to be taken advantage of to a considerable extent by the print journalists. Newspapers, as well as radio stations, are also interested in audio equipment to make the task of quick and accurate reporting easier.

It is the unanimous judgment of the Conference that the Court rules for the one-year trial period should provide that arrangements for electronic coverage in each particular case be in the exclusive control of the presiding judge, after hearing from the litigants and the interested news representatives. To require the consent of all parties would mean that in practice

here in Delaware there would be little or no coverage, given the extent of the opposition reflected in the survey. (Florida experienced an inability to obtain such consent, before the Florida Courts dropped that requirement. See Chandler, supra.)

VI. PROPOSED COURT RULE

Canon 3A.(7) of the Delaware Judges' Code of Judicial Conduct currently prohibits "broadcasting, televising, recording or taking photographs in the courtroom and areas immediately adjacent thereto during sessions of court or recesses between sessions." Modeled after the Florida rule, the Bar-Bench-Press Conference recommends that the Delaware Judges' Code be amended for the period of September 1, 1981 through August 31, 1982, by suspending Canon 3A.(7) in its entirety and temporarily adopting a new Court rule as follows:

(1) A judge may permit broadcasting, televising, recording, and taking photographs in the courtroom and areas immediately adjacent thereto with the same limitations in the interest of the fair administration of justice as are applicable to the press and public generally, subject to the following standards:

(a) Interested news representatives shall petition the presiding judge for permission to cover the judicial proceeding electronically;

(b) The presiding judge shall give all interested parties and participants an opportunity to be heard on the petition(s) for electronic coverage, but the final decision as to coverage rests with the presiding judge alone, and such decisions are not subject to appeal or extraordinary writ by news representatives during the period of the experiment;

(c) Not more than one television camera, operated by not more than one television camera person, shall be permitted in any court proceeding. The arrangements for still cameras and audio equipment shall be within the sole discretion of the presiding judge. Any "pooling" arrangements among news representatives required by these limitations on equipment and personnel shall be the sole responsibility of the news media without intervention by the presiding judge;

(d) No supplemental lighting devices and no distracting sounds shall be permitted in connection with electronic courtroom coverage;

(e) Photographic, audio and other equipment shall be positioned in such location as shall be designated by the presiding judge;

(f) There shall be no audio pickup of conferences between counsel and client, between co-counsel of the client, between counsel and the presiding judge held at the bench, of members of the jury, and of any other person (including witnesses) whom the presiding judge in his sole discretion in any particular case orders protected from electronic coverage;

(2) Every presiding judge shall keep accurate records on forms provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts of all applications made pursuant to these rules, and pertinent data of all instances when broadcasting, televising, recording, and photography is permitted pursuant to these rules. Such reports, including any written comments received by the

presiding judge from any of the participants or observers, shall be submitted to the Administrative Office of the Courts on a monthly basis.

(3) The Bar-Bench-Press Conference shall make itself available to monitor the experiment and to submit a report at least one month before the end of the experiment as to its recommendations.

DELAWARE JUDGES' CODE
OF
JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Canon 3 A(7):

- "(7) A judge should prohibit broadcasting, televising, recording, or taking photographs in the courtroom and areas immediately adjacent thereto during sessions of court or recesses between sessions, except that a judge may authorize:
- (a) The use of electronic or photographic means for the presentation of evidence, for the perpetuation of a record, or for other purposes of judicial administration;
 - (b) The broadcasting, televising, recording, or photographing of investigative or ceremonial proceedings;
 - (c) The photographic or electronic recording and reproduction of appropriate court proceedings under the following conditions:
 - (i) The means of recording will not distract participants or impair the dignity of the proceedings;
 - (ii) The parties have consented, and the consent to being depicted or recorded has been obtained from each witness appearing in the recording and reproduction;
 - (iii) The reproduction will not be exhibited until after the proceeding has been concluded and all direct appeals have been exhausted; and
 - (iv) The reproduction will be exhibited only for instructional purposes in educational institutions."

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

In re: Canon 3A(7) of the
Delaware Judges' Code of
Judicial Conduct

§
§
§

Before HERRMANN, Chief Justice, McNEILLY, QUILLEN and HORSEY, Justices.

ORDER

This 29th day of April, 1982,

Whereas on January 15, 1982, this Court issued an Order, captioned as above, which provided that Canon 3A(7) of the Delaware Judges' Code of Judicial Conduct be suspended for a period of one year, commencing May 1, 1982 and ending May 1, 1983, for appellate proceedings in the Delaware Supreme Court, under specific and detailed guidelines to be approved by this Court;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the Guidelines, attached hereto and made a part hereof by reference, be and they are hereby adopted for the governance of photographic and electronic news coverage of appellate proceedings in this Court, under the suspension of Canon 3A(7) as to such proceedings provided by the above-mentioned Order of this Court for the period of one year commencing on May 1, 1982.

BY THE COURT:



Chief Justice

GUIDELINES
FOR THE GOVERNANCE
OF
PHOTOGRAPHIC AND ELECTRONIC
NEWS COVERAGE
IN THE
DELAWARE SUPREME COURT

May 1, 1982 - May 1, 1983

With prior notice to the Clerk or Chief Deputy Clerk of the Supreme Court, electronic and photographic news media may record and photograph oral arguments in the Supreme Court of Delaware, during the period May 1, 1982 to May 1, 1983, provided that the orderly procedures of the Court are not impaired or interrupted. Except as otherwise ordered by the Court, the following guidelines shall be strictly followed:

(1) Equipment and personnel.

(a) Not more than one video tape camera, operated by not more than one person, shall be permitted.

(b) Not more than one still photographer, utilizing not more than two still cameras and two lenses for each camera, shall be permitted.

(c) Audio pickup for all media purposes shall be accomplished from the existing tape-recording system in the Supreme Courtroom.

(d) Any "pooling" arrangements among the media required by these limitations on equipment and personnel shall be the sole responsibility of the media. No member of the Court shall be called upon to mediate any dispute as to the media representative or equipment authorized to cover a particular proceeding. In the absence of advance media agreement as to

disputed equipment or personnel, the Chief Justice or presiding Justice shall exclude all photographic and electronic equipment for the proceeding or proceedings involved.

(2) Sound and light criteria.

(a) Only photographic and electronic equipment which does not produce distracting sound or light shall be employed. Specifically, photographic and electronic equipment shall produce no greater sound or light than the equipment, designated in the Schedule annexed, in good working order. No portable lighting device of any kind shall be employed.

(b) It shall be the duty of media personnel to demonstrate to the presiding Justice or designee, in advance of any proceeding, that the equipment intended to be utilized meets the above sound and light criteria. Failure to obtain such advance approval for equipment shall preclude its use.

(3) Location of equipment personnel.

(a) Video tape camera equipment shall be positioned in such locations in the Courtroom as shall be designated by the Chief Justice or presiding Justice. A video tape camera shall remain in its designated location as inconspicuous as practicable. The area designated shall provide reasonable access to coverage. Video tape recording equipment which is not a component part of a video tape camera shall be located in an area remote from the Courtroom.

(b) Still camera photographers shall position themselves in locations in the Courtroom designated for the purpose by the Chief Justice or presiding Justice. The areas designated shall provide reasonable

access to coverage. A still camera photographer shall take a position within a designated location and, thereafter, shall remain in that location as inconspicuous as practicable.

(c) Media representatives shall not move about the Courtroom while proceedings are in session.

(4) Movement of equipment during proceedings.

Photographic and electronic equipment shall not be placed in or removed from the Courtroom except prior to commencement or after adjournment of proceedings each day, or during a recess. Neither video tape cassettes nor still camera film shall be changed in the Courtroom except during a recess in the proceeding.

(5) Courtroom light sources.

With the prior approval of the Chief Justice, modifications or additions may be made in light sources existing in the Courtroom, provided such modifications or additions are installed and maintained without public expense and without substantial change in the structure or appearance of the Courtroom.

(6) Conferences of the Court.

There shall be no audio pickup of conferences which may occur among Justices on the Bench.

SCHEDULE

VIDEO TAPE ELECTRONIC CAMERAS

1.	Ikegami	HL-77 HL-33 HL-35 HL-34 HL-51 HL-52 HL-53 HL-79
2.	RCA	TK 76
3.	Sony	DXC-1600 Trinicon
4.	ASACA	ACC-2006
5.	Hitachi	SK 80 SK 90
6.	Hitachi	FP-3030
7.	Philips	LDK-25
8.	Sony BVP-200	ENG Camera
9.	Fernseh	KCN-92
10.	JVC-8800 u	ENG Camera
11.	AKAI	CVC-150 VTS-150
12.	Panasonic	WV-3085 NV-3085
13.	JVC	GC-4800 u
14.	Sony	BVP 300
15.	NEC	MN-71
16.	Ampex	

VIDEO TAPE RECORDERS used with video cameras

1.	Ikegami	3800	6.	JVC	4400
2.	Sony	3800	7.	Sony	3800H
3.	Sony	BVU-100	8.	Sony	BVU-50
4.	Ampex	VPR-20	9.	Sony/RCA	BVH-500/TH50
5.	Panasonic	NV-9400	10.	Fernseh	BCH-20

STILL CAMERA

35 mm Leica "M" Series Rangefinder